

SPEECH

OF

ORLANDO B. FICKLIN, OF ILLINOIS,

ON THE

REDUCTION OF THE TARIFF.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1846.

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE UNION OFFICE.

1846.

SEVEN ON
18-6A
FLEET

SPEECH.

In the House of Representatives, July 1, 1846—

On the bill reducing the duties on imports and for other purposes.

Mr. FICKLIN addressed the committee as follows:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: "The world is governed too much." This sentiment, whether applied to persons or things, politics or religion, is no less true than it is forcibly and beautifully expressed. It is the constant, the unceasing struggle of the few, to gain absolute dominion over the consciences, the pockets, and persons of the many. For this purpose, statutes are sometimes so written and framed that the multitude cannot understand them. The Roman emperor adopted the plan of having the laws written in small letters and placed on a pillar so high up that the common people could not read them. Our lawmakers effected the same object by a different method in framing the tariff act of 1842. They concealed their ideas, their meaning, with words, and covered them up with technical terms so effectually that the masses cannot understand their import. Minimum and specific duties constitute a part of the machinery cunningly devised for that purpose.

What is a minimum duty? It means the smallest amount possible—and is adopted in the tariff act of 1842 as a false valuation, used for deceptive and mischievous purposes. It is made to apply to cotton fabrics and yarns in the following class of cases, to wit: 20, 30, and 35 cents, are the minimums as applied to those which are cotton fabrics in whole or in part; 60 and 75 are the two minimums applied by that act to cotton yarns. That law provides that all cotton cloths, costing less than 20 cents per square yard, shall be assumed to have cost 20 cents a yard, and a duty of 30 per cent. ad valorem is levied accordingly. Take a coarse article of cotton goods, costing 4 cents per yard in England, and the tax imposed on it is precisely the same as that levied on the fine article costing 20 cents per yard, thus making the coarse article pay five times as much tax in proportion to its value as the fine article. So on the minimums which apply to cotton yarns. The duties are alike unjust; and a tax ranging from 30 to 150 per cent. ad valorem is imposed under the disguises of that act. I give you the following exposure prepared by an able hand:

"On all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton is a component part, not dyed, colored, printed, or stained, not exceeding in value 20 cents per square yard, shall be valued

at 20 cents per yard;" and on that assumed value a duty of 30 per cent. is imposed, which amounts to 6 cents on every square yard.

"On all fabrics of the same description, if dyed, colored, printed, or stained, in whole or in part, not exceeding in value 30 cents, shall be valued at 30 cents the square yard;" and on that assumed value a duty of 30 per cent. is imposed which amounts to 9 cents on every square yard.

"On velvets, cords, moleskins, lustians, buffalo cloths, of which cotton is a component part, or goods manufactured by napping, or raising, cutting or shearing, not exceeding in value 35 cents per square yard, shall be valued at 35 cents;" and on that assumed value a duty of 30 per cent. is imposed, which amounts to 10 cents 5 mills per square yard.

Cotton twist, yarn, and thread, unbleached and uncolored, costing less than 60 cents per pound, shall be valued at 60 cents per pound; and on that assumed value a duty of 30 per cent. (18 cents per pound) is imposed.

On the same articles, bleached or colored, costing less than 75 cents and over 60 cents per pound, shall be valued at 75 cents per pound; and on that assumed value a duty of 30 per cent. (22 cents 5 mills per pound) is imposed.

The duties actually paid on importations under the minimums in the present tariff, reduced to real ad valorem duties, range from 30 to 162 per cent., as appears by the report of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, during the 1st session of the 26th Congress, being document 306.

Now let us examine the specific duty incorporated in that act.

Where the same amount of tax is imposed upon all articles of the same kind, per gallon, bushel, yard, or ton, without reference to the value or cost thereof, that is a specific duty. For instance, silk fabrics, used for dresses, pay \$2 50 per pound, whether they be coarse or fine, cheap or dear; thus the coarse silk dress pays as much duty as the fine one costing five times as much. The same remark applies to brown and loaf sugar and molasses, on which a fixed and invariable specific duty is laid without reference to their real cost or value. Is this just, or is it right? Again, the tariff act of 1842, discriminates in favor of the rich and against the poor. Here I will give a few instances. The farmers pay from 30 to 150 per cent. on their iron, and implements made of iron, about 100 per cent. on coarse flannel, from 65 to 190 per cent. on sugar, 35 to 170 per cent. on molasses, and from 106 to 170 on salt; while fine flannel is taxed about 40 per cent., rich silk for dresses 22 per cent., gold watches, diamonds and gems, $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The reason assigned for the low tax on jewelry is the facility with which it can be smuggled into the country.

It was charged from the first, that the odious tariff of 1842 was framed by a delegation of manufacturers, who visited Washington and hung about the

Capitol till they secure its success; and there are, indeed, strong inherent marks in the bill itself to prove that such was the fact, for its discriminations and its leanings are against the farmer.

Take the following articles, for instance: All berries, nuts, and vegetables used in dyeing; all dye-woods, barilla, Brazil wood, kelp, lac dye, madder, madder-root, crude saltpetre, shellae, sumach, and turmeric are admitted duty free, because it benefits and encourages the manufacturer.

Further to encourage the manufacturer, and to prejudice the sheep-grower in this country, the cheap-priced wool which comes in competition with our wool, is admitted at a duty of 5 per cent. ad valorem, flax is admitted at about 8 per cent., when reduced to ad valorem rates, raw hides at 5 per cent. ad valorem, linseed 5 per cent. All these articles—wool, flax, raw hides, and linseed—come in competition with those which the farmer produces for market. If it were deemed necessary, this catalogue of discriminations for the benefit of the manufacturer, and against the farmer, might be multiplied to an indefinite extent; but the instances enumerated sufficiently prove and establish the fact that the tariff of 1842 is emphatically the manufacturers' bill—taxing other industrial interests for their benefit—and should, therefore, be repealed.

So odious and hideous is this protective policy in its naked condition, before it has been arrayed in its rich drapery, that its friends seek to give it a popular but false name, to cover up its deformity. The principle itself is the personification of the veiled prophet, and is permitted to pass through the world only when it is masked.

The distinguished Kentucky statesman [Mr. Clay] zealously and ably supported the tariff of 1824, and sought, in the course of his remarks, to baptise it as the American policy; and Mr. Webster, of Massachusetts, who was then opposed to that tariff bill, indignantly repudiated the effort. In his speech on the tariff of 1824, Mr. Webster, in reply to Mr. Clay, who was then speaker of the House, said:

"And allow me, sir, in the first place, to state my regret, if indeed I ought not express a warmer sentiment, at the names, or designations, which Mr. Speaker has seen fit to adopt, for the purpose of describing the advocates and the opposers of the present bill. It is a question, he says, between the friends of an 'American policy,' and those of a 'foreign policy.' This, sir, is an assumption which I take the liberty most directly to deny."

* * * * *

"Indeed, sir, it is a little astonishing, if it seemed convenient to Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of distinction, to make use of the terms 'American policy,' and 'foreign policy,' that he should not have applied them in a manner precisely the reverse of that in which he has in fact used them. If names are thought necessary, it would be well enough, one would think, that the name should be, in some measure, descriptive of the thing; and since Mr. Speaker denominates the policy which he recommends 'a new policy in this country,' since he speaks of the present measure as a new era in our legislation; since he professes to invite us to depart from our accustomed course, to instruct ourselves by the wisdom of others, and to adopt the policy of the most distinguished foreign states, one is a little curious to know with what propriety of speech this imitation of other nations is denominated an 'American policy,' while, on the contrary, a preference for our own established system, as it now actually exists, and always has existed, is called a 'foreign policy.'"—(See first volume Webster's speeches, p. 265 and 266.)

Here I may be permitted to remark, that although I shall have occasion to quote frequently from the speeches of Mr. WEBSTER, on this subject, it is with no view to disparage him, but to establish facts and elucidate principles on which his great mind

has shed so much light. Thus, it will be seen, that Mr. WEBSTER in a few words exposed the deception which the friends of the protective policy aimed to impose on the country, by giving their favorite measure a false name. So far from being American, the prohibitory policy was resorted to by the most ignorant and unenlightened nations of the world, centuries ago—as, for instance, China, Japan, and others—while the protective policy has been adopted for centuries, by England, France, and most of the crowned heads of Europe.

From the early ages of that monarchy, England has fostered her woollen manufactures. There are provisions in "black-lettered statutes," passed during the reigns of the Edwards and the Henrys, designed to aid and support them. They went so far as to make it the law of the land that each coffin should be lined with woollen, and that each person should be buried in a woollen shroud, not for the purpose of keeping him warm in the dark, cold grave, to which he was consigned—not to prevent the worms from "keeping their revels" upon the corpse, but for the purpose of collecting a tax for the benefit of the woollen manufacturer.

Nor is this all: the clergy were required to read the act of pains and penalties to their congregation as part of the service; and they, under the corrupt union of church and State in that country, shared in the spoils, growing out of the violations of the law. This is the system, sir, that is fraudulently called the "American policy."

Setting out with a fraudulent name, we shall see as we progress if the whole scheme is not conceived in fraud.

The friends of protection seem to understand the "magic of a name," and, throughout its whole progress, they have selected household words with which to try and endear the system to the people. "Encourage and protect American labor and industry"—these are mere catch-words designed to deceive. The most of the manufacturing establishments are incorporated as our banks are; they are generally owned by wealthy capitalists, and the stocks are sold daily in the Boston market as bank, railroad, or other stocks are. Now there is nothing to prevent the English capitalist from owning as many shares as he chooses. He may have part or all of these factories, and he may send over British money to defray expenses and British operatives to do the work. Even the paupers may be taken from the factories in England, brought to this country, and be placed in the Lowell factories in less than twenty days' time; yet this is American labor, and must be encouraged, to the prejudice of the native-born citizen here, who, with his own hands, ploughs his corn, cultivates his fields, and attends to and takes care of his stock. Out upon all such humbuggery! It is a fraud upon the people. What says Mr. WEBSTER upon this subject?

"I will now proceed, sir, to state some objections which I feel, of a more general nature, to the course of Mr. Speaker's observations.

"He seems to me to argue the question as if all domestic industry were confined to the production of manufactured articles; as if the employment of our own capital, and our own labor, in the occupations of commerce and navigation, were not as emphatically domestic industry as any other occupation. Some other gentlemen, in the course of the debate, have spoken of the price paid for every foreign manufactured article, as so much given for the encouragement of foreign labor, to the prejudice of our own. But is not every such article the product of our own labor as truly as if we had manufactured it ourselves? Our labor has earned it, and paid the price for it. It is so much added to the stock of national wealth. If the commodity were dollars, nobody

would doubt the truth of this remark; and it is precisely as correct in its application as any other commodity as to silver. One man makes a yard of cloth at home; another raises agricultural products, and buys a yard of imported cloth. Both these are equally the earnings of domestic industry, and the only questions that arise in the case are two: the first is, which is the best mode, under all the circumstances, of obtaining the article; the second is, how far this first question is proper to be decided by government, and how far it is proper to be left to individual discretion."—(See first vol. Webster's speeches, p. 259 and 290.)

Thus it will be seen that Mr. WEBSTER exposes this deception—the false cry about American labor.

"Protect us against the pauper labor of Great Britain." This fallacy I propose to refute next.

I maintain there is but little difference between the wages paid to the laborer in the New England and the British factory, and that cotton goods can be made cheaper here than there, as the facts of the case will show. Here let me state a fact perhaps not generally known. Our machinery is equal, if not superior, to that across the Atlantic. Indeed, it is the fact that most of the machinery used at this time in the British factories is of Yankee invention.

Thus stands the account: We have the machinery, we raise the cotton, and have less taxes to pay. They purchase the cotton here, take it to England, and pay freights and taxes upon it; have it manufactured, and then pay freight on it back here, besides commissions, insurance, and other incidental expenses. Thus it is most palpable that we can undersell the British in this market, unaided by a tariff. I will here present a detailed statement, which has already been spread before the public, and which most fully proves the fact that not only in our market, but also in foreign markets, can ours successfully compete with the British manufacturers:

"Now the fact is that there is but very little difference in the wages paid to the British operative and those paid to the American. They differ but little in nominal amount; and, when we take into consideration the fact that the American operative toils more hours, and produces more cloth, yarn, or whatever it may be, than the British, the balance will incline in favor of the British operative, and against the American—against the British manufacturer, and in favor of the American.

"I will now refer to facts to sustain my assertions. The following are the rates of wages per week paid to the operatives in the Lancashire cotton factories in England, as drawn up by the chamber of commerce at Manchester, and are nearly an average for the whole kingdom, viz:

Occupations.	Sterling currency.		Equivalent in federal money.		
	s. d.	s. d.			
Spinners—men,	20	to 25	\$4 80	to \$5 00	
Do women,	10	to 15	2 40	to 3 60	
Stretchers,	25	to 26	6 00	to 6 21	
Piercers, (boys and girls,)	4	to 7	1 10	to 1 68	
<i>In the card room—</i>					
Men,	14	to 17	3 48	to 4 08	
Young women,	9	to 9 6	2 16	to 2 28	
Children,	6	to 7	1 44	to 1 68	
Throstle-spinners,	5	to 9 6	1 20	to 1 28	
Reelers,	7	to 9	1 68	to 2 16	
<i>Weavers by power—</i>					
Men,	13	to 16 10	3 12	to 4 06	
Women,	8	to 12	1 92	to 2 76	
<i>Weavers by power—</i>					
Dressers, (men,)	29	to 30	6 72	to 7 20	
Winders and warpers,	8	to 11	1 92	to 2 64	
Mechanics,	21	to 26	5 76	to 6 24	
<i>Promiscuous occupations—</i>					
Machine makers, (men,)	26	to 30	6 24	to 7 20	
Iron foundries,	do	28	to 30	6 72	to 7 20
Tailors,	do	18	to 20	4 32	to 4 80
Shoemakers,	do	15	to 18	3 60	to 4 32
Whitesmiths,	do	22	to 24	5 28	to 5 76
Sawyers,	do	24	to 28	5 76	to 6 72
Carpenters,	do	20	to 25	4 80	to 6 00
Bricklayers,	do	17	to 20	4 08	to 4 80

In Sheffield, the great seat of the manufacture of cutlery, wages vary from 25s. (\$6) to 35s. (\$8 40) per week; and workmen in the skilled departments get 40s. (\$9 60) per week. The authority on which I rely in the statement of wages which I have given above, is Symon's Arts and Artisans, pp. 2 and 3. See, also, Wade's History of the Middle and Working Classes, pp. 670-4; and Ure's Philosophy of Manufactures, p. 476.

So far, I have cited British authors only. I will now refer to a few American authorities, and to one which will be deemed reliable by the friends of the protective system. In a document sent to the Senate on the 12th day of January, 1842, by the Hon Daniel Webster, then Secretary of State, communicating certain consular returns, I find a full statement of wages paid to operatives and artisans in Glasgow, Scotland; a few of which I extract, in order to show their general concurrence with the rates given from the British authors to whose works I have referred.

Occupations.	Sterling currency.		Federal money	
Bootmakers,	16	to 21	\$3 81	to \$5 04
Bookbinders,	20	to 24	4 80	to 5 75
Chain and anchor makers,	25	to 30	6 00	to 7 20
Hatters,	35	to 45	8 40	to 10 80
Tailors,	15	to 20	3 60	to 4 80
Bricklayers,	20	to 23	4 80	to 5 52
Cotton spinners,	16	to 24	3 84	to 5 76
Power loom weavers,	7	to 9	1 68	to 2 16
Carpet weavers,	15	to 16 6	3 60	to 3 96

In the consular returns communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Calhoun, Secretary of State, March 3, 1815, the following rates of wages are given for London—viz:

	\$7 65	to \$7 20	average per week.
Beaver hatmakers,	\$7 65	to \$7 20	" "
Boot and shoemakers,	4 80	to 7 20	" "
Silk weavers, plain work,	2 88	to 4 32	" "
" " fancy work,	3 60	to 5 04	" "
Bricklayers,	96	to 1 20	per day
Millwrights & machinists,	1 20	to 1 68	" "
Masons,	1 20	to 1 52	" "
Shipwrights,	1 20	to 1 41	" "
Smiths,		1 44	" "
Weavers and dyers	72	to 2 40	" "
Tailors,		12	per hour

This will suffice for the rates of wages in England.

We hear much of the distress and suffering of the manufacturing classes in England. They are never distressed, except when they are thrown out of employment by great commercial revulsions. Then, from their numbers, and their want of means, they suffer immensely. In a few generations we shall witness the same scenes of distress and suffering in the large manufacturing communities of this country; but not so long as the oppressed workman has cheap new land to flee to, on which he can plant himself and become independent—which land the government should make still cheaper. A luxurious growth of men and women—of independent freemen—is far more valuable to the State than a paltry revenue, gleaned from the sales of its domains. But, to return.

In this country the data in relation to these facts are not so copious and full as in England; yet I have some whig authority to show the amount paid to the operatives in the United States. I have before me an extract from a letter written by the Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, member of Congress from Boston, dated August 8, 1844, in which he gives the following as the "net wages paid to girls after paying their board," (\$1 25) in the following factories in New Hampshire, to wit:

Jackson Company, May, 1844	\$1 80	per week.
Nassau " " " "	1 83	"
Amoskeag " " " "	2 03	"
Stark Mills " " " "	1 85	"

This letter of Mr. Winthrop was written for electioneering purposes, and therefore, it is to be presumed, he made out as fair a case for the factory proprietors as the truth would warrant.

I have, from another and more authentic source—the returns of the factories themselves—the average wages per week paid to the operatives at Lowell during the years 1833 and 1841, which are as follows, viz:

	1833.	1841.	Decrease.
Wages of females,	\$2 00	\$1 75	25 cents.
" males,	7 50	6 70	80 "

The wages of the females are clear of board. The males board themselves. Deducting the price charged in Lowell for the boarding men, (\$1 75,) and their wages per week would be \$4 95.

In making a comparison between the wages paid to factory operatives in this country and England, other circum-

stances are also to be taken in consideration. In England the operatives are required to work but 69 hours each week. At Lowell they are required to work 74 hours; and at Manchester, N. H., 76½ hours, as appears by the following table:

HOURS OF LABOR AT LOWELL.

In January	-	-	11 hours 24 minutes.
In February	-	-	12 "
In March	-	-	11 " 52 "
In April	-	-	13 " 31 "
In May	-	-	12 " 55 "
In June	-	-	12 " 45 "
In July	-	-	12 " 45 "
In August	-	-	12 " 45 "
In September	-	-	12 " 43 "
In October	-	-	12 " 16 "
In November	-	-	11 " 46 "
In December	-	-	11 " 21 "

HOURS OF LABOR AT MANCHESTER.

In January	-	-	11 hours 30 minutes.
In February	-	-	12 "
In March	-	-	12 "
In April	-	-	13 " 30 "
In May	-	-	13 "
In June	-	-	13 "
In July	-	-	13 "
In August	-	-	13 "
In September	-	-	13 "
In October	-	-	13 "
In November	-	-	13 "
In December	-	-	13 "

In this country the female operatives tend more looms than the same class of operatives do in England. Those two considerations—viz: the greater number of the hours of labor and tending more looms—much more than counterbalance the nominal difference in the rates of wages in the two countries, which is not more than 10 per cent.

Thus it appears that *cheapness of labor is actually on the side of the American manufacturer.*

I have been copious in my facts touching this point, because I desired to put at rest forever the falsehood that the wages of labor are much, if any lower in England than in this country; and that a high prohibitory tariff is necessary, in order to protect the American manufacturer against his rival in England—in the catch-phrase of the day, the "pauper" labor of Europe.

I shall now proceed to show that the *American manufacturer can produce all the coarser descriptions of fabrics cheaper than the British manufacturer can produce them, and that the former does undersell the latter in the markets of the world.*

The advantages which the American manufacturer has over his British rival are as follows, viz:

1. In freight.—It costs the British manufacturer, as appears by Hunt's Magazine, October, 1843, about one cent per pound for freight upon his cotton from New Orleans or Mobile to Liverpool; while it costs the American manufacturer less than half a cent for freight from New Orleans or Mobile to New York or Boston. This is equal to 6 per cent. on the raw material in favor of the American manufacturer. Supposing the cotton to be worth eight cents per pound, on the 400,000 bales consumed by the American manufacturers they save at least \$500,000 in freight, which their British rivals have to pay.

2. The American manufacturer generally buys his cotton immediately from the producer, and thus saves a commission to the cotton importer, which the British manufacturer is compelled to pay, and which is equal to 5 per cent. more. Thus, on the item of cotton alone, the American manufacturer saves at least 11 per cent., which his British rival is obliged to pay.

3. In the cost of flour, used in bleaching and sizing. The American cotton manufacturers use about 30,000 barrels of flour per annum in bleaching and sizing. In consequence of the high duties on flour, the same quantity would cost the British manufacturer about \$3 more per barrel than it costs the American manufacturer. Here is another item of \$90,000 in favor of the latter on that quantity of flour.

4. In the greater cheapness of water-power used by the American manufacturer, as compared with steam, used by his British rival.

5. The American manufacturer has not yet been troubled so much with combinations and turn-outs among the operatives as the British manufacturer has been.

6. In the greater cheapness of provisions in this country, as compared with their prices in England. To show the advantage which the American manufacturer has over his British rival in this particular, I again copy from Symon's Arts and Artisans, page 70:

Articles of provisions.	Price.	Fed'l money.
Bread, 26 pounds weight	- 5 shillings	\$1 20
Bacon, per pound	- 9 pence	18
Potatoes, per bushel	- 2 shillings	48
Tea or coffee per pound	- 5 shillings	1 20
Sugar, per pound	- 8 pence	16
Butter, " "	- 1s. 2d.	28
Cheese, " "	- 9 pence	18

Under this head may also be classed the greater cheapness of fuel, oil, and candles.

7. The heavy taxation to which the British manufacturer is subject, and from which the American is exempt. In addition to the heavy taxes on his buildings, fixtures, &c., the British manufacturer is obliged to pay a stamp-tax on every bill, receipt, promissory note, and other paper which he may give in the transaction of his business.

All these circumstances operate greatly in favor of the American manufacturer, and give him great advantage over his British rival, enabling him beyond all question to produce his fabrics at a much less cost than the British manufacturer can possibly produce his.

I have before me the estimate of an American manufacturer, (a Mr. Kempton,) furnished a few years since to the committee of the British Parliament appointed to investigate the factory system of that country, (for which see Factory Commission Report, Part I—Evidence by Central Board, pages 23, 24,) showing conclusively that the American manufacturer can produce his fabrics at a cheaper rate than the British. It follows:

	United States.	England.
Interest on dressing machine,	£2 11s.	£1 12s.
Interest on 12 power looms,	8 6	4 10
Cost per annum of one-horse power,	4 10	12 10
Cost of dressing 3,736 pieces,	23 9	46 18
Cost of weaving,	125 4	136 10
	£163 00	£222 00
Cost of manufacturing in America per piece,	10½d.	
" " " " " " " " " " " "	England per piece,	1s 2½d.

I will show, by extracts from letters written by Englishmen, residing at different places abroad, which I copy from Dr. Ure's History of the Cotton Manufacture of Great Britain, that, even so far back as 1831, the American manufacturer successfully competed with the British manufacturer in the markets of the world.

Mr. George Wilson, of Rio Janeiro, writes: "We fear that we shall be under the necessity of reshipping to Rio all the domestics we brought down with us, as the market of Port Allegre is completely overdrawn by the Americans in this article."

Mr. W. P. Paton reports that there were in the Manilla market "35,240 pieces of 36 inches wide, and 7,000 pieces of 28 inches wide, grey, of American manufacture; while of the British manufacture, for the same period, there were only 1,832 pieces."

Mr. Gibson, of Aux Cayes, writes, in 1834, "That in the unbleached domestics, a class of goods of great importance, the Americans were cutting out the British."

Mr. John Hough, of Malta, writes: "That the Americans had, in a great measure, driven the British article (cotton domestics) from the market."

Mr. Atkinson, of Smyrna, writes: "Domestics are a very current article of consumption, but almost 20,000 pieces have arrived, principally from America."

Thus ten years ago the American manufacturer was a successful rival of the British in the markets of the world in the article of domestic cottons. And at the present moment he is still more so. He undersells his British competitor in all the markets of Asia as well as of South America. The fabrics of the Stark mills, in Manchester, N. H., have even been exported to England, and sold at a lower rate than the British manufacturer could sell the same article of like quality for at his own door.

The fact is, the American manufacturer can produce his fabrics cheaper than they can be produced in any other portion of the world. And I have it from the best authority—a leading manufacturer of New England—that the American woollen manufacturer produces a better article of cloth, and at a cheaper rate, than the British, except in the item of dressing and finishing, in which the latter excels the former.

To sustain the assertion, that the American manufacturer can successfully compete with his British rival in the markets of the world, I have the best possible whig authority, it being no less than the editor of the New York Tribune. He says:

"Two or three of the Lowell companies which made good dividends last year earned them altogether by manufacturing for foreign markets, where their products came in direct competition with the cheap fabrics of England."

[Tribune, Aug. 14.

How idle, then, is it to talk of the necessity of a prohibitory tariff to protect a class of men who are able to compete with the whole world in their peculiar business? And should such men be favored with "protection," which enables them to monopolize the home market, and thus to compel their countrymen to pay for the same article of manufacture 100 per cent. more than the people of England pay, while they sell the same to foreigners for a little more than one-half of what they charge their own countrymen?

Are laws which favor such practices founded upon the great and unchanging principles of truth, justice, and equity? And is such legislation to be tolerated in a republican government, which repudiates the idea of favored classes and exclusive privileges? Let the American people respond.

It is true that Great Britain can beat us in manufacturing paupers, but it is not true that she can undersell us in cotton fabrics in the American market. The tariff, therefore, on cotton fabrics works badly in two respects: it irritates Great Britain that we should shut her out of the market by prohibitory duties, and it enables the manufacturers here to combine and demand high prices, because the whole market is in their own hands.

If the pauper labor of England were so desirable there is no difficulty in the world (such are the facilities of the steamships) of bringing them from Leeds, Birmingham, Manchester, and other manufacturing towns, and placing them in the shops in Lowell.

But this cry is deceptive, and without just cause. Should we desire native American pauper labor, it will be manufactured to our hands by these lordlings who own the factories, and out of the operatives who conduct them. What degrades human beings more than to have them dependent for their daily bread upon a wealthy employer? If you control a man's bread you control his will; and though you may not call him a vassal, a serf, or slave, yet he is governed by his employer.

What is the effect of this system upon the fair sex. Thousands of these girls are taken from their homes and families and pent up in these shops, and are classed and denominated "factory girls." What could be more manifestly contrary to the designs of Providence, or to the true interests of our widespread country, than to have a large proportion of the females of this land confined through life to shops and factories?—doomed to be old maids, and to live without an object or an aim beyond their mere animal wants?

Another view may be taken of this pauper labor. If it were true, as alleged by the manufacturers, that the goods produced in England by pauper labor would be brought here and sold to us for a less price than the makers of our fabrics would sell them to us for, then the proposition would be to all who are not manufacturers to tax themselves for the benefit of the manufacturer here—to pass a law imposing high duties on goods the product of pauper labor, so as to prevent ourselves by law from buying where we can buy cheapest, and thereby compelling us to buy at home at higher prices. Stripped of its mask, this is the proposition. Do you, who are not manufacturers, pay those of us who are, two prices for our goods from pure feelings of patriotism. This modest request is now unblushingly made, and a clamor is raised if it is not complied with. While a nation possessing paupers bears all the odium of having made them so, other countries trading there are benefited by that pauper labor in the greater cheapness of price of the manufactured article.

"Protect your infant manufactures." This has been the cry for the last thirty years, and what these infants asked as a boon in 1816 is demanded as a

right in 1846. These infants, it would seem, ar never to become of age and commence housekeeping on their own hook. The age of twenty-one has long since passed over their heads, and yet they rely upon the plea of infancy and insist upon government patronage and protection. Away with such infants; they should be weaned, and the government should no longer act the part of nurse to them.

A home market is another one of the delusive promises held out by the advocates of the protective policy, and which is wholly fanciful. To reconcile the farmers to this monstrous doctrine of paying two dollars when they should pay but one for an article, they promise to purchase the corn, wheat, beef, pork, &c., &c., of the farmer, giving good prices and thereby producing good times. This promise is as false as the protective policy is unjust.

A moment's reflection and examination in regard to the agricultural products of the country will prove that the promise is preposterous upon its very face, and of necessity is made but to be broken. That the manufacturing establishments in the eastern States are beneficial to the farmer on a small scale, and to those who have gardens and raise vegetables, for such establishments, is doubtless true; but they are mainly supplied by the agriculturists in the immediate vicinity, and the amount they consume is scarcely perceived in the great provision-growing regions of the country; like a drop in the ocean, its influence is unseen and unfelt. A few figures will show the absurdity of this promise of a home market beyond all question. In the west one hand will cultivate 25 acres of land in corn, which, at a very low estimate, will yield thirty bushels per acre—making 750 bushels. In Europe the estimate is about five bushels of grain to the man per year; but as we feed better in this country, allow ten to the head, and one man would produce sufficient corn for 75 persons. So that 74 out of every 75 would have to abandon farming, and go to manufacturing or something else in order to give us a home market.

I will here present another view of this question exhibited by facts and figures prepared by a competent hand, which totally explodes this home-market humbug.

Number of persons engaged in the four leading manufactures:

Iron manufacture	-	-	30,349
Hardware and cutlery manufacture	-	-	5,492
Woollen manufacture	-	-	21,342
Cotton manufacture	-	-	72,119

129,000

In 1839 there were raised in the middle States—			
Wheat	-	-	84,823,272 bushels.
Corn	-	-	377,531,875 "
Rye	-	-	18,645,567 "
No. of neat cattle	-	-	14,971,586 "
Swine	-	-	26,301,293 "

Allowing for the consumption of each person six bushels of wheat and six of corn and rye, (which is nearly twice as much as each person consumes,) and to each family two swine and one beef, (which is much more than they actually consume,) and the result is as follows:

Whole number of bushels of wheat	-	84,823,372
Whole quantity consumed by the manufacturer	-	4,653,072
Surplus	-	80,170,300

Whole number of bushels of corn and rye - - - -	396,176,442
Quantity consumed - - - -	4,653,072
Surplus - - - -	391,523,370
Whole number of swine - - - -	26,301,293
Number consumed - - - -	258,504
Surplus - - - -	26,042,789
Whole number of neat cattle - - - -	14,971,586
Number consumed - - - -	129,252
Surplus - - - -	14,842,334

Thus I think it is shown by facts and figures most clearly that the promise of a home market is an idle humbug.

This whole land from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, would have to present unbroken lines of workshops and factories before their inmates could consume the grain and other provisions raised by the farmer.

This preposterous argument in favor of a home market may be exposed in another way. It is estimated that there are fourteen times as many persons engaged in agriculture as in the protected branches of manufacture, to wit: 3,719,607 persons in agriculture, and 264,351 in the protected manufacturing and mechanic classes.

Now, before a home market could be furnished, the whole business pursuits of life in this country would have to be reversed, and fourteen times as many people would have to embark in manufactures as were engaged in agriculture, a thing totally out of the question. These fanciful promises and fine spun theories of the manufacturer are hollow and baseless, and the farmer should no longer permit himself to be taxed to support any branch of business that will not support itself.

The next humbug to be noticed, and perhaps it is one of the most barefaced and impudent connected with this protective policy, is that "high duties produce low prices." The story of the miller and his toll, which originated in Illinois, and went the rounds of the papers in 1844, shows up this heresy in its true light. It is this: A democratic miller enlarged his toll-dish, and on applying it to the grain of his whig customers taken to him to be ground, some of them complained, and he produced whig speeches to prove to them that the higher the duty the lower the price, and consequently the greater the toll taken by the miller the more meal the customer would get. If speeches from their own partisans would not convince them of the truth of such a monstrous absurdity of course nothing else would.

This whole absurd theory of high duties producing low prices has been so completely exploded by the venerable member from Massachusetts, [Mr. J. Q. Adams,] that I cannot forbear introducing what he has said; and I may add that he doubtless entertains the same opinions still, for I never heard of his changing or retracting them in the slightest degree:

Mr. Adams from the Committee on Manufactures, May 23, 1832, made the report from which these extracts are taken.

"The doctrine that duties of import cheapen the price of the articles upon which they are levied, seems to conflict with the first dictates of common sense. But its supporters first appeal with confidence to the fact, that most of the ar-

ticles upon which additional duties were levied by the tariff of 1828, have since that time fallen considerably in price, and then they argue that it must be so by the excitement of competition in the market. It is certainly contrary to the natural course of things that an addition to the cost should be a reduction to the price of an article. True it is that the duty gives a spur to the production of the article at home. The price of any article in the market must always depend upon the relative condition of the demand and supply at the time and place of sale. But very slight variations of time or place affect often to a very great extent the relative proportion of the demand and the supply; and consequently, the price of the article. No safe conclusion can be drawn from the fact, that subsequent to the tariff of 1828, the prices of the articles upon which the duties were then increased have fallen, unless from the circumstances it can be shown that the increase of the duty was the cause of the fall in price; nor will it be sufficient to prove so strange a paradox to account for it by the excitement of competition. Wherever there is a profitable market there will be competition. Had the tariff of 1828 never been enacted, the competition in our markets would have been as great, and would have been as effectual, to reduce the prices, as it has been with the aggravation of duties.

"In that competition our own manufactures might not indeed have shared, but it would have existed in all its force between those who furnished the supply, and could not have failed to reduce the prices to the level of the moderate profit necessary to the existence of the trade."

Again:

"The incidental effect of competition in the market, excited on the part of the domestic manufacturer by the aggravation of duty upon the corresponding article imported from abroad to reduce the price of the article must be transient and momentary. The general and permanent effect must be to increase the price of the article to the extent of the additional duty, and it is then paid by the consumer; if it were not so—if the general effect of adding to a duty were to make the price of the article upon which it is levied less—the converse of the proposition would also be true; and the operation for increasing the price of the domestic article would be to repeal the duty upon the same article imported—an experiment which the friends of our internal industry will not be desirous of making."

As further proof that the duty enters into the price of an article, and that it is, as a general rule, paid by the consumer, I may be permitted to quote from the speeches of Mr. Clay:

"The exporter of an article, if he invests its proceeds in a foreign market, takes care to make the investment in such merchandise as, when brought home, he can sell with a fair profit; and, consequently, the consumer would pay the original cost, and charges, and profits."—[Vol. 2, p. 36, *Life and Speeches of Henry Clay*, published by Greeley & McElrath, 1844.]

Again:

"If there is any truth in political economy, it cannot be that result will agree with the prediction; for we are instructed by all experience that the consumption of any article is in proportion to the reduction of its price, and that, in general, it may be taken as a rule that the duty on an article forms a portion of its price."—Same volume, page 144.

It is most true that the price of many manufactured articles has fallen since the passage of the tariff act of 1842; and it is also true that the price of articles not protected has fallen. This is owing to many very potential causes unconnected with and independent of the tariff. The improvements in machinery, the fall in the price of raw cotton, reduction in the price of wages, and a scarcity of money, each and all contribute to cheapen the price of the cotton fabrics; and it is idle to say that the tariff has done it, for no opinion could be more erroneous. Our legislation should be so shaped on this subject as to equalize the burdens on the people as far as possible, and to open to us the markets of other countries, in order that we might sell where we could sell dearest, and buy where we could buy cheapest. The general rule in political economy, with but few exceptions, is, that the consumer here pays the whole of the duty levied upon articles not produced in this country—as, for instance, a duty of 25 or 50 per cent. on French silks and wines not manufac-

tured here, or on tea, coffee, and spices, would all be paid by the consumer, and would go into the treasury in the shape of revenue.

When the duty is so high as to exclude the foreign article altogether—as, for instance, 150 per cent. on coarse domesties—it is not pretended that the duty enters into the price of the article, but the market is thereby wholly secured to domestic manufactures; and the only hope which the purchaser has of getting the article at a fair price is in the home competition in its production.

When the duty is not sufficiently high to exclude the foreign article, as in the case of iron, sugar, fine prints and cloths, the consumer pays the whole of the duty on the imported article; or if he purchase its rival, the domestic article, then he pays in the enhanced price to the manufacturer an amount equivalent to the duty.

To illustrate: we pay on brown sugar $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound specific duty, and we do not grow sufficient for consumption by 115,664,840 pounds, which last amount we imported in 1845. Say that we wish to purchase one hundred dollars worth of an article of sugar on which the duty is 40 per cent.: there are two houses; one selling the foreign article, and the other the domestic article. If we buy the foreign article, \$40 of the \$100 will go into the treasury as the duty. If we buy the domestic article, the sugar planter gets the \$40 in the increased price as encouragement to his industry, and the treasury does not in the latter instance receive anything. But in both cases the farmer pays \$100 for the same number of pounds of sugar which he could have purchased for \$60 but for the duty. That I may not mislead you, or be misunderstood myself, I would state that the average of duties under the tariff law of 1842, is something over 31 per cent., thereby making you pay the enormous sum of \$31 out of every \$100 for the goods you purchase either to the importer or manufacturer, as the case may be.

A few moments may be well spent in examining the article of iron, which has an enormous duty, and yet we do not make sufficient to supply the home demand. We imported last year 2,054,461 cwt., and manufactured in this country about 480,000 tons of iron; thus proving clearly that the consumer is taxed, whether he purchase the home or the foreign article. Mr. WEBSTER, in the speech above referred to, at pages 299 and 300 speaks thus of that branch of business:

"The true reason, sir, why it is not our policy to compel our citizens to manufacture our own iron, is, that they are far better employed. It is an unproductive business, and they are not poor enough to be obliged to follow it. If we had more of poverty, more of misery, and something of servitude—if we had an ignorant, idle, starving population—we might set up for iron makers against the world."

When any given branch of business cannot support itself, it should be abandoned at once; otherwise it becomes a charge, not upon a county or State, but upon the general government—a burden upon the whole people, and all the other industrial pursuits. Not being able to live without taxing its neighbors for its support, the manufacturing business is the personification of a pauper or vagrant; and having no visible means of subsistence, it should be dealt with accordingly. Suppose that the people of the west should take it into their heads to enter largely into the culture of tea, of sugar, and of coffee, by aid of hot-houses and other forced and unnatural appliances, and should go to the manufacturers and say to them, Protect us against the pau-

per labor of China, Java, Cuba, and other countries producing these articles; give us two prices for our products for the "encouragement of American industry," and to prevent us from paying tribute to other nations. Would they consent to do it? "Could they serew their courage to the sticking point?" Or would they bring their liberality to the paying point? All of them would answer in the negative; and yet the principle is the same as that contended for by the manufacturers; and it applies with unerring truth and certainty to every kind of business which does not support itself. If the case put above exposes the deformity of the principle, and illustrates its injustice, it will do so in all other cases, though in different degrees, when "protection for protection's sake" is sought to be enforced by law.

Nation after nation has tried in vain to stimulate, by artificial means, the culture of crops unsuited to their climate, and the manufacture of articles not adapted to the tastes, habits, or interests of their people, but it is in vain; though they have greatly mutilated the face of nature, yet they have not been able to reverse her laws. Spain not only exhausted her ingenuity, but her treasury and the energies of her people, in devising laws of prohibition, of restriction, and of government monopolies. I will again invoke the aid of Mr. WEBSTER to show the fallacy of governmental interference with the pursuits of men. On pages 291 and 292, same volume as above, he says:

"Mr. Speaker has referred to the late Emperor Napoleon, as having attempted to naturalize the manufacture of cotton in France. He did not cite a more extravagant part of the projects of that ruler—that is, his attempt to naturalize the growth of that plant itself in France; whereas, we have understood that considerable districts in the south of France, and in Italy, of rich and productive lands, were at one time withdrawn from profitable uses, and devoted to raising, at great expense, a little bad cotton. Nor have we been referred to the attempts, under the same system, to make sugar and coffee from common culinary vegetables; attempts which served to fill the print shops of Europe, and to show us how easy is the transition from what some think sublime, to that which all admit to be ridiculous. The folly of some of these projects has not been surpassed, nor hardly equalled, unless it be by the philosopher in one of the satires of Swift, who so long labored to extract sunbeams from cucumbers."

He says:

"The first man I saw was of a meagre aspect, with sooty hands and face. His hair and beard long, ragged, and singed in several places. His clothes, shirt, and skin, were all of the same color. He had been eight years upon a project for extracting sunbeams out of cucumbers, which were to be put into phials hermetically sealed, and let out to warm the air in raw and inclement summers. He told me he did not doubt, in eight years more, he should be able to supply the governor's gardens with sunshine at a reasonable rate; but he complained that his stock was low, and entreated me to give him something as an encouragement to ingenuity, especially as this had been a dear season for cucumbers."

This is a case needing protection and encouragement.

Retaliation was another argument of the protectionists—that is, because Great Britain taxed her subjects who purchased the products of this country, we must tax our citizens who purchase the products of that country. If A whips his children, B should go home and whip his also by way of retaliation; this is the argument. Now, if Great Britain could tax our citizens then it would be retaliation for us to tax her subjects; but no such power exists in either government; each one is confined in the taxing power to its own people, as it rightfully should be.

—This argument of retaliation, however specious,

is now swept away. Great Britain has reduced the duty on all the commodities except tobacco, which we send to that country, and we should pursue a like liberal and enlightened policy. Mr. Jefferson was of opinion that, so soon as a single nation would tender to us free trade, we should accept it. I give his words. In a report made by Mr. Jefferson on the 14th of December, 1793, he used the following language: "Would even a single nation begin with the United States this system of free commerce, it would be advisable to begin it with that nation; since it is one by one only that it can be extended to all. When the circumstances of either party render it expedient to levy a revenue by way of impost on commerce, its freedom might be modified in that particular, by mutual and equivalent measures preserving it entire in all others."

Fourteen-fifteenths of the people of this country are and must continue to be farmers and planters; four-fifths of the whole exports, which average about one hundred million are agricultural products, which will appear from the following table:

Year.	Whole amount of exports.	Of which were the products of agriculture.
1840,	\$113,895,631	\$92,525,330
1841,	166,332,722	83,747,947
1842,	92,963,996	73,635,113
1843, (9 months)	77,793,783	64,867,171
1844, (last returns)	99,715,179	79,890,410
	\$490,776,314	\$394,678,980

Hence it is shown that the agricultural is the paramount interest in this country. It is the strongest at the ballot-box by more than ten to one; it has the power in its own hands, and yet it has been begged and coaxed, not to say cheated and duped, into the support of manufacturers, when the money to do it with was taken out of the pockets of the farmers.

In 1845 there was exported from this country 863,516,371 lbs. of cotton, which were sold for \$51,739,643: something like five-sixths of the whole crop of cotton is exported, and most of it sold to Great Britain. At least one-half of the whole exports from this country is its cotton; and yet the present tariff cripples the sale in foreign countries by taxing enormously high the articles received in exchange for it.

How is it with the great staples of the west? Not a single article produced in Illinois receives one cent of benefit from the protective tariff; and yet the foreign market is almost closed to us, because we have well nigh taxed those nations out of our market, who would otherwise gladly exchange their commodities for ours. Thus we not only, by this short-sighted policy, compel ourselves to pay two prices for the articles made here, but by restrictive, protective, and, in some instances, prohibitory duties, we keep out of our markets those nations who would willingly give us their salt, iron, sugar, and clothing for our cotton, corn, wheat, beef, pork, &c., &c. The south has hitherto complained most bitterly of these protective tariffs; but their hand is laid most heavily upon the west. The south can always sell her raw cotton at some price, because Great Britain cannot obtain it elsewhere. Not so with our staples. She can be supplied at high prices from the continent of Europe with her provisions. A new era has dawned upon the agricultural States in regard to this question. They now present an unbroken phalanx against the protective policy, and they have only to will its destruction in order to

achieve it. "Let us alone," is the only petition that the farmer and planter need send to the government.

When Alexander the Great called upon Diogenes to know "what he could do for him, Diogenes requested Alexander to stand out of his sunshine." It is so with the agriculturist. If the government will only let them alone—not tinker with the individual pursuits of men, but leave every branch of business open to honorable competition—deal out justice to all and favors to none, then we should avoid these revulsions and panics growing out of tariff laws.

I will here give two short extracts from Mr. Webster's speech in regard to free trade, delivered in the House of Representatives April, 1824:

"In short, sir, the general sense of this age sets, with a strong current, in favor of freedom of commercial intercourse and unrestrained individual action. Men yield up their notions of monopoly and restriction, as they yield up other prejudices, slowly and reluctantly; but they cannot withstand the general tide of opinion."

Again:

"Mr. Chairman, the best apology for laws of prohibition, and laws of monopoly, will be found in that state of society, not only unenlightened but sluggish, in which they are most generally established. Private industry, in those days, required strong provocatives, which governments were seeking to administer by these means. Something was wanted to actuate and stimulate men, and the prospects of such profits as would, in our times, excite unbounded competition, would hardly move the sloth of former ages. In some instances, no doubt these laws produced an effect, which, in that period, would not have taken place without them. But our age is wholly of a different character; and its legislation takes a different turn. Society is full of excitement; competition comes in place of monopoly; and intelligence and industry ask only for fair play and an open field. Profits, indeed, in such a state of things, will be small, but they will be extensively diffused, prices will be low, and the great body of the people prosperous and happy."

The following beautiful sentiment, so fraught with sound philosophy and liberal philanthropy, has not, though uttered centuries since, by one of England's wisest monarchs, been properly heeded or sufficiently pursued, either by that or this country. He said to the commissioner who was charged with the negotiation of a treaty with Naples, that,

"The earth being the common mother of us all, what can be more desirable or praiseworthy than, by means of commerce, to communicate her various productions to all her children."—Anechus, p. 313.

The Chinese will exchange his silks and tets—the Portuguese the rich wines of Oporto and Madeira—the Frenchman the silks of Provence—the Malay the spices of Banda and Amboyna, of Ternata and Tidore—the Arab the coffee of Mocha—the Hindoo the muslins of Dacca—the Englishman the broadcloth, the cotton goods, and cutlery of Sheffield, Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham—the Spaniard his sugar, grown in Cuba—the Portuguese his Turk's island salt, for articles of traffic and of commerce which we have to spare.

The Creator of the universe, in giving to various countries various climates and various susceptibilities in their productions, has furnished bonds by which to draw man to man and nation to nation, and unite them together by ties of brotherhood. He is no philosopher or statesman who would throw a Chinese wall around each nation, and compel each one to grow or manufacture everything that it consumed. Trade and commerce, like religion, should be left free and unfettered by human laws. "The wind bloweth where it listeth," and commerce, equally free, should be wafted by it untaxed and uncontrolled, to any port on earth to which it is invited by the best market. The tide of public opinion in this enlightened age sets strongly

in favor of free trade. Take Great Britain: Blandering on in legislative restrictions, she, in common with Spain, France, and Portugal, forbade, under heavy penalties the export of gold and silver from the kingdom. In 1350 she passed an act fixing the price of labor; at another time she granted to corporations the exclusive privilege of selling, not only the woollen goods of the realm, but also the very necessities of life. Another mode of interference with her subjects was the law of apprenticeships, by which every one was prohibited making cloth, unless he had served as an apprentice to the business for the term of seven years. Yet another mode of legislative interference is found in the British corn laws, now in existence over two hundred years, by which 28,000,000 of people are compelled to eat hard bread in order to swell the rent-rolls of landlords. The land of England is owned by an aristocracy of thirty-two thousand persons, who have it cultivated by poor tenants, and who have managed for the last two centuries to keep up the corn tax for their peculiar benefit. Great Britain now sees the folly of her system of legislative tinkering in favor of one class of her subjects over another; and she is disposed to retrace her steps slowly, but certainly. To sustain this position, I will here give an extract from the speech of Mr. Goulburn in the British Parliament, published in the *Economist* of May 30, 1846:

"Mr. Goulburn then passed to a general review or summing up of the experience of the country on all the measures which had been introduced since 1842. In 1842, duties were reduced or repealed on *five hundred and eighty-two* articles; in 1843, on *seven* articles; in 1844, on *four* articles; and in 1845, *twenty-one* articles were reduced, and on *four hundred and forty-eight* articles the duties were repealed. In the present year, the measures which have already passed the House of Commons reduce the duties on *one hundred and twelve* articles, and repeal the duties on *fifty-four* articles. In the whole period in question—in the five sessions beginning with 1842, and ending with the present—the duties on *seven hundred and twenty-seven* articles have been reduced, and those on *five hundred and one* articles have been entirely repealed—articles, too, which have nearly all, though some to a lesser and others to a greater degree, affected the condition of the great masses of the people, either in their food or clothing, or in the supply of those great staple articles of raw material which are so essential to the manufactures, and consequently to the industry of the country.

"Considering the great reductions thus made in the customs and excise duties, Mr. Goulburn was anxious to show that the experiments which the government has made in this wise and enlightened course of financial legislation, by which commerce and industry had been so much benefited, had not in any degree impaired the general state of our finances, or added to the permanent debt of the country. On the contrary, the success of these free-trade experiments had been so great that, notwithstanding the great reductions, every test which could be taken of the financial condition of the country showed that it had rather been improved than impaired."

A further proof is also found in the repeal of the British corn-laws.

Take another instance of the injurious effects of the restrictive, and the tendency to a liberal policy, which is found in the manufacture of silks—which, by-the-by, is wholly artificial in Great Britain, and was commenced as early as the reign of Edward III. Various laws were from time to time enacted for the protection of this branch of industry, and in 1765 the importation of silk goods manufactured in other countries was entirely and strictly prohibited, which gave to the manufacturers of this article the exclusive control of the home market. This system continued till 1824, at which time it was wholly changed, and the high duty of four

shillings per pound on raw silk was reduced to three pence, and the enormous duty of fourteen shillings and eight pence per pound upon thrown silk was reduced to seven shillings and six pence. It may appear strange, but it is no less strange than true, that for the next twelve years succeeding this rapid reduction in duty the quantity of raw and thrown silk used by the manufacturers was increased over one hundred per cent.; which is accounted for in the spur with which competition was driven forward, and the consequent reduction of price, which enabled the common people to wear silk goods which had before been used only by the wealthy.—(See 1st vol. *Porter's Progress*, page 253.)

The then chancellor of the exchequer, (Mr. Robinson,) on the 22d of February, 1824, in pressing this measure, delivered a speech from which I will make a very few extracts. He said:

"For some years past there has certainly prevailed in this country, among its ablest statesmen and our most eminent writers—I should say, indeed, among all men of sense and reflection—a decided conviction that the maintenance of this prohibitory system is exceedingly impolitic."

Again, he says:

"There never was so favorable an opportunity as the present for carrying our principles into effect, and for inviting foreign powers to act in accordance with them. Let us invite them to join with us in cutting the cords that tie down commerce to the earth, that it may soar aloft unconfined and unrestricted. [Hear, hear.]"

And again:

"I therefore hope that the House will think it full time to throw down this hollow, gilded, and distorted idol of imaginary protection; to hurl it from its base, and to establish on the same foundation the well-proportioned statue of commercial liberty. [Hear, hear, hear.]"

By turning to the debates in the British Parliament, in May, 1820, it will be found that Lord Lansdowne, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Liverpool deplore their system of commercial prohibitions and restrictions, and greatly desired a gradual return to free-trade, to commercial emancipation.

Lord Lansdowne expressed this beautiful sentiment:

"No axiom was more true than this: that it was by growing what the territory of a country could grow most cheaply, and by receiving from other countries what it could not produce except at too great an expense, that the greatest degree of happiness was to be communicated to the greatest extent of population."

Need I say to you that even Massachusetts, now so abused of her sisters for her protective and plundering propensities, was originally opposed to the system, because her interest was found in the shipping, commercial, and fishing employments, and that she warned the friends of protection and privilege against its evils?

I here give the resolutions of the Boston meeting, with an extract of Mr. WEBSTER'S remarks upon them:

TUESDAY, October 3, 1820.

GENERAL MEETING.

Yesterday an adjourned meeting on the subject of the proposed tariff was held at Faneuil Hall, Hon. William Gray, chairman, and William Foster, jr., secretary.

A long and interesting report was read from the respectable committee appointed at a former meeting, which concluded with the following resolves:

1st. *Resolved*, That we have regarded with pleasure the establishment and success of manufactures among us, and consider their growth, when natural and spontaneous, and not the effect of a system of bounties and protection, as an evidence of general wealth and prosperity.

2d. That, relying on the ingenuity, enterprise, and skill of our fellow-citizens, we believe that all manufactures adapted to our characters and circumstances will be introduced and extended as soon and as fast as will promote the public interest, without any further protection than they now receive.

3d. That no objection ought ever to be made to any amount of taxes equally apportioned, and imposed for the purpose of raising revenue necessary for the support of government, but that taxes imposed on the people for the sole benefit of any one class of men are equally inconsistent with the principles of our constitution and with sound policy.

4th. That the supposition that, until the proposed tariff or some similar measure be adopted, we are, and shall be, dependent on foreigners for the means of subsistence and defence is, in our opinion, altogether fallacious and fanciful, and derogatory to the character of the nation.

5th. That high bounties on such domestic manufactures as are principally benefited by that tariff favor great capitalists rather than personal industry, or the owners of small capitals, and therefore that we do not perceive its tendency to promote national industry.

6th. That we are equally incapable of discovering its beneficial effects on agriculture, since the obvious consequence of its adoption would be that the farmer must give more than he now does for all he buys, and receive less for all he sells.

7th. That the imposition of duties which are enormous, and deemed by a large portion of the people to be unequal and unjust, is dangerous, as it encourages the practice of smuggling.

8th. That, in our opinion, the proposed tariff, and the principles on which it is avowedly founded, would, if adopted, have a tendency, however different may be the notions of those who recommend them, to diminish the industry, impede the prosperity, and corrupt the morals of the people.

James T. Austin, esq., and the Hon. Daniel Webster addressed their fellow-citizens in favor of the report and resolves in speeches which were distinguished for closeness of argument, variety of illustrations, and abundance of fact.

The report was then accepted, and the resolves recommended by the committee unanimously passed.

A vote of thanks to the Hon. Mr. Otis, of the Senate, and to those members from this State in the House of Representatives of the United States who opposed the new tariff, was unanimously agreed to.

The report constituting the preamble to the above resolutions is too long for insertion this day, forming twenty-three manuscript pages. It is to be printed in a pamphlet.

Here is wholesome truth plainly and cogently spoken. It reads strangely by the side of the recent Lawrence letters and the subsequent speeches and votes of Mr. Webster.

But let us see on what grounds these free-trade resolutions were then commended to the unanimous judgment of the good people of Boston. Here is a passage from the argument of the master-spirit of the occasion. In addressing that Faneuil Hall meeting on the 2d October, 1820, Mr. Webster said:

"There is a power in names; and those who had pressed the tariff on Congress, and on the country, had represented it as immediately, and almost exclusively, connected with domestic industry and national independence. In his opinion, no measure could prove more injurious to the industry of the country, and nothing was more fanciful than the opinion that national independence rendered such a measure necessary. He certainly thought it might be doubted whether Congress would not be acting somewhat against the spirit and intention of the constitution in exercising a power to control essentially the pursuits and occupations of individuals in their private concerns; a power to force great and sudden changes, both of occupation and property, upon individuals, not as incidental to the exercise of any other power, but as a substantial and direct power. If such changes were wrought incidentally only, and were the necessary consequence of such impost as Congress, for the leading purpose of revenue, should enact, then they could not be complained of. But he doubted whether Congress fairly possessed the power of turning the incident into the principal; and instead of leaving manufactures to the protection of such laws as should be passed with a primary regard to revenue, of enacting laws with the avowed object of giving a preference to particular manufactures, with an entire disregard to all the considerations of revenue; and instead of laying such imposts as would best answer the purpose of raising revenue, with the least burden on the public, carrying the impost on certain articles to a burdensome excess, with a full knowledge that the increase of duty will diminish the amount of revenue raised."

If further proof were desired on this point, it is

found in the speech of Mr. Webster on the tariff of 1828. He says:

"New England, sir, has not been a leader in this policy. On the contrary, she held back herself, and tried to hold others back from it, from the adoption of the constitution to 1824. Up to 1824 she was accused of sinister and selfish designs, because she discountenanced the progress of this policy."—Vol. 1, page 307, Webster's speeches.

Again, in his celebrated speech on Foote's resolutions, Jan. 20th, 1830, he says:

"Sir, I beg leave to say in regard to the east, that the original policy of the tariff is not hers, whether it be wise or unwise. New England is not its author."—page 365, same volume.

With the exception of the solitary article of tobacco, the duty levied by Great Britain on our staple products is merely nominal, and she is our best customer. I propose to submit a table of imports and exports, showing that the balance of trade is in our favor, and that she purchases more of us than we do of her:

"But let us look a moment to facts, and see how this balance of trade practically operates. I find, on recurring to Hunt's Magazine for September, 1815, page 231, a table exhibiting the balance for and against us, with all countries; from which I quote the balances against us, and in favor of Spain, Brazil, and China, for the years 1842, 1843, and 1844, viz:

Year.	In favor of Spain, and against the U. States.	In favor of Brazil, and against the U. States.	In favor of China, and against the U. States.	Total.
1842	\$6,833,293	\$3,347,312	\$3,490,248	\$12,690,853
1843 (9 mo.)	3,026,810	2,155,376	1,966,698	7,143,783
1844	7,023,640	4,065,534	3,174,211	14,263,385
	\$15,903,743	\$9,568,236	\$8,631,170	\$34,103,149

Here is a large balance of trade—amounting in the aggregate, for the two years and nine months, to the sum of \$34,103,149—against the United States, and in favor of three nations possessing, comparatively, but little foreign commerce. Now, how did the United States get the means to pay this debt? It was by selling to other nations enough more than she took of them to pay the debts which she owed to those of which she bought more than she sold to them. During the same period, the balances of the United States against England and her dependencies were as follows, viz:

Year.	Balances against England, and in favor of the United States.
1842	\$13,693,697
1843 (nine months)	17,923,233
1844	16,262,754
	\$47,879,614

These large balances against England enabled the United States to pay the balances which she owed to Spain, Brazil, China, and other countries. Great Britain, in her turn, accumulated balances against other nations; and thus in the circle of trade, all nations make an exchange of equivalents. Each, in the long run, loses nothing; and each is enriched by the amount of its annual industry beyond the cost of its annual consumption.

I would say to our brethren in all parts of this Union, with the kindest feelings, "come and let us reason together;" let us as brethren modify the tariff and reduce it to the revenue standard, which will of itself furnish ample protection for all reasonable purposes. Let us do so that peace, harmony, and friendship may once more exist between the farmer and manufacturer.

The protection which a revenue tariff would furnish, willingly conceded by the other industrial interests of the country—blotting out all jealousies and heartburnings heretofore engendered, binding

up the bruises and wounds which this act has inflicted, securing to the manufacturer the good will and sympathy of the agriculturist, and last, though not least, giving permanency to the laws on this subject—would be infinitely preferable to the present act, for there can be no peace, quiet, or harmony, while it lives upon our statute book. This war between the farmer and the manufacturer is an unnatural one, forced upon them by misguided and misjudging politicians.

A treaty of peace and amity should be concluded between the parties, and the manufacturer should be satisfied, if the farmer is so, with the protection incident to a revenue tariff. To the sugar planter I would say, if you cannot prosper under a revenue tariff, then it is evident that sugar is not the article for you to cultivate, and your lands are eminently adapted to the culture of cotton; therefore turn your attention to growing it.

To the iron-master and coal-monger, I would say, that if your business cannot be sustained and will not support itself under a revenue tariff, it should be abandoned; leave it for the present; the coal and the iron ore will not travel away from your mountains, but will patiently await till it is profitable for you to work them.

Coming, as I do, from one of the most decided corn-growing regions of the Union, and representing a people who bow not to the behests and commands of superintendents either of factories or furnaces, it will be expected of me to give my views as to the effect of the repeal of the corn-laws in Great Britain upon that interest in this country. I will premise that I regard it as of the utmost importance to the farmers of the west. The rapid increase of population in Great Britain, and the comparative slow increase, not to say perfect stand still, of the neighboring countries in Europe, favors the proposition that they are not likely to be fed from those countries. The boundless extent of our territory, and the rapidly increasing number of our population, speaking the same language with themselves, point us out to British statesmen as their best customers for all that they may have to sell. Reciprocity of trade, now tendered by Great Britain, if met in a proper spirit, will give us a market for the surplus productions of the western farmer. Great Britain will purchase of those who purchase of her; and she can clothe us, and we can feed her to the mutual benefit of each nation.

Shall the western farmers look to the two hundred and eighty-four thousand three hundred and fifty-one manufacturers (the estimated number of the protected classes) as furnishing a market for the immense surplus of corn, beef, pork, and other articles of the farm, rather than look to the twenty-eight millions of souls in Great Britain, who are inviting us to unfetter commerce, and meet them upon the just, equitable, and sacred principles of free trade?

Great Britain can furnish us a market if she will; our manufacturers cannot if they would; the former is practicable, the latter is impossible. A few counties in one of the new States would produce provisions sufficient to feed the whole of the manufacturers of this country. Millions of dollars worth of farm products perish annually in the west for want of a market. Wheat remains unthrashed, corn ungathered, cattle and hogs unfattened because the channels of trade are blocked up by the restrictive tariff of 1842.

To prove that Great Britain is our best customer

for farm products, I give the following statistical statement:

Table showing the amount of flour and Indian corn exported from this country to Great Britain and her colonies during the commercial year of 1840:

	Flour.		Indian Corn.	
	Quantity.		Quantity.	
	barrels.	value.	bushels.	value.
England	605,778	\$3,310,294	101,936	\$50,925
Scotland	15,141	77,049		
Ireland			2,905	1,649
British Guiana	3,325	17,668	2,203	1,419
East Indies	4,565	23,310		
West Indies	232,329	1,246,981	144,820	92,316
Cape of Good Hope,	2,007	11,350		
Mauritius	80	540		
Australasia	1,538	7,866		
British American colonies	432,356	2,124,421	130,747	72,453
	1,297,119	\$6,819,514	381,611	\$227,757

	Barrels.	Value.
Whole quantity of flour exported from the United States to all countries in 1840	1,897,501	\$10,143,615
Of which Great Britain and her colonies purchased	1,297,119 & paid 6,819,514	
Leaving for all other countries	600,382	\$3,324,101
Or less than one-third in quantity and value.		
	Bushels.	Value.
Indian corn exported	572,249	\$338,333
Of which Great Britain purchased	381,611 & paid 227,757	
	192,668	\$101,576

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, for it is a fixed axiom in political economy, that the commerce between nations must be mutual in order to be continued, and it is equally true that Great Britain, well understanding her best interests, will trade with the nation that has the ability and the will to trade with her. The commercial system of northern Europe (whose wheat could alone come in competition with ours) is so restrictive, amounting almost to prohibition, that they could not successfully compete with us in that trade.

We are told that the regions bordering on the Baltic and Black Sea are to be our successful rivals. Their population is generally at a stand still, while that of England is increasing annually at the rate of four hundred thousand; their commerce is considerable, as will be seen by reference to the statistical tables; their tariffs discourage exchange and barter of commodities, and the wheat trade must enure to our benefit if we shape our course properly. In corroboration of my views as to the augmentation of population, and the increasing demand for wheat in England, I give an extract from the remarks of Sir Robert Peel on this subject:

"The addition made to the number of the population of this country every year, was such as would require from 100,000 to 200,000 acres to be taken into cultivation for wheat to meet the wants of the increased population. In such a state of things, you must be able to add almost an additional county under cultivation every year." In the same debate, Sir G. Clerk, the vice president of the Board of Trade, said: "Within the last five years, there has been imported into this country ten millions of quarters of corn, or two millions annually. The experience of the last thirty

years proved that the rate of population advanced more rapidly than the rate of production, and that this was true was attested by the fact that for a long series of years we had every year been compelled to increase our importations of foreign corn in proportion as we approached more closely to the present time; and hearing in mind this fact, the truth of which was not to be contested, he could not help thinking—no matter how vigorously—no matter how scientifically the arts of agriculture might be applied to the enrichment of the soil—for the next ten years we would be compelled to import 3,000,000 of quarters of corn annually instead of two."

Great Britain now imports annually an average of about 14,000,000 of bushels of wheat, most of it from Dantzie, in Prussia, and Odessa, in Russia; and I propose now to give some further facts as to the impediments of that trade, both in regard to the Baltic and Black seas. Mr. Platt, in his treatise on the corn-laws, says:

"The corn-growing countries in the southeast of Europe, and in the countries bordering the Black sea, export their produce by the Don, the Dnieper, the Dniester, and the Danube, or by land carriage to Odessa, for shipment to foreign countries; and that port stands in the same relation to the south of Europe as Dantzie does to the northern part. The principal supply, however, is brought to the town in carts, drawn by oxen, from distances varying from one to four hundred miles. The voyage to England is long, and there is great risk of the grain heating, and the expense of importing amounts to 15s. or 16s., or even 20s. the quarter, or 60 cents the bushel. Mr. Jacobs's account of the manner in which corn is transported to Odessa, shows the physical impossibility of this competition becoming a matter of anxiety to the most timid agriculturist."

I will now furnish some further facts in regard to the wheat stored at Dantzie, tending to show the clogs that are upon that trade:

"The largest supplies of grain imported into Great Britain have generally come from Dantzie. The grain is chiefly brought from the interior on the river to Vistula, Bug, &c., in flatboats of the rudest construction, open to the effects of the weather and the hand of the pilferer. During the passage, which lasts several weeks, and even months, the sprouting of the wheat on the top forms a thick mat, and that constitutes a tolerable covering for the bulk. The boats carry from 180 to 200 quarters (1,440 to 1,600 bushels) of wheat; are navigated by six or seven men, with a small boat to sound ahead, to find the shifting shoals; are broken up and the materials sold at Dantzie. The wheat (all but the grown surface) is thrown out upon the fields and dried, and then stored in warehouses, the whole of which are capable of holding 500,000 quarters, (4,000,000 bushels.) The average cost of the inland freight, including waste, is 5s. and 6d per quarter, equal to 25 cents per bushel. The expense of drying, cleaning, and warehousing, at Dantzie, is 2s. more, or six cents per bushel."

From 1835 to 1845, the average price of wheat in England was \$1 75 per bushel; the exchange is generally about 9 per cent., which would, to that extent, favor the exportation, showing thereby most conclusively, that our farmers can drive a profitable business in the wheat trade.

I here give a short extract from a table of exports:

"The effect of the corn-law in anticipation merely in the city of New York on exports, is as follows:
From Jan. 1, to June 30, 1846. 1845.
Corn, (bushels) 529,697 73,266 (7 times as great)
Cornmeal, (in barrels) 54,137 13,507 (4½ times as great)
Lard, (kegs) 76,737 41,950 (nearly twice as great)
Wheat, 322,885 11,600 (200 times as much)
Flour, (wheat) 414,075 103,615 (4 times as much)
Rye flour, 6,499 2,701 (2½ times as much)
Butter, 19,037 15,661 (1¼ as much)

There is yet another staple article of the west, and that is Indian corn, or maize, as it is called in England, in the export of which my constituents are more interested than in almost any other. The Wabash, running the whole extent of my district, (like ancient Egypt,) is famed far and near for its abundant production of this article.

Indian corn is not grown in England, except as

an ornamental plant in their gardens, nor is it produced for exportation to much extent in any country but in ours. In this article, as in those of tobacco and cotton, we can enjoy very nearly a monopoly of the British market.

There is at this time a great revolution in public opinion progressing in that country on this subject, and it is all important that the western farmer shall look to his interest in this particular.

Immense quantities of Indian corn may be consumed in that country for the purpose of fattening cattle alone. On this subject I beg leave to refer to the speech of Sir Robert Peel, delivered in January last:

"I propose, therefore, that an article of grain which I believe might be applied to the fattening of cattle shall hereafter be imported duty free. [Cheers.] It is an article of immense importance—maize, or Indian corn. [Cheers.] I propose that the duty upon it shall be hereafter and immediately nominal. [Hear.] I do not consider that, by the removal of the duty on maize, I am depriving agriculture of any protection. I understand that in the United States maize is used partly as human food, and that in this country its utility as human food is too much disregarded. [Hear, hear.] In some parts of the continent it is held to make excellent food, and it might be advantageously applied in the same way in Great Britain. To promote the free import of maize seems to me so far from doing agriculture a disservice, it will be doing it a benefit, by promoting the nourishment and fattening of cattle."

It is only within the last few months that corn meal has been admitted into Great Britain at one shilling duty, and no article of food has heretofore grown into favor with such rapidity, and that, too, with all classes. No nation can compete with us; and the time is at hand when the toiling millions of that country will look to the West for bread as fully and entirely as their manufacturers now look to the South for their cotton. The cheapness and abundance of the articles are fully illustrated by the following table prepared by the Commissioner of Patents, showing the amount of wheat and corn raised in the United States last year:

	Wheat.	Corn.
Ohio	13,573,000	57,600,000
Pennsylvania	12,580,000	17,126,000
Indiana	7,044,000	30,625,000
Illinois	4,563,000	25,584,000
New York	16,200,000	13,250,000
Virginia	11,885,000	27,272,000
Tennessee	8,340,000	70,625,000
Kentucky	4,769,000	54,625,000
Michigan	7,061,000	4,945,000
Maryland	4,884,000	3,273,000
North Carolina	1,969,000	14,887,000
South Carolina	1,168,000	8,184,000
Maine	502,000	1,912,000
New Hampshire	647,000	1,328,000
Massachusetts	241,000	3,098,000
Rhode Island	5,000	731,000
Connecticut	114,000	2,649,000
Vermont	854,000	1,728,000
New Jersey	1,050,000	7,314,000
Delaware	440,000	516,000
Georgia	1,571,000	2,713,000
Alabama	980,000	16,650,000
Mississippi	378,000	2,067,000
Missouri	1,525,000	15,625,000
Arkansas	2,427,000	8,250,000
Florida	—	733,000
Wisconsin	971,000	672,000
Iowa	793,000	2,028,000
District of Columbia	15,000	35,000
	106,548,000	417,899,000

Of the above amount, at least one-half can be spared for exportation, and we are capable at this time of producing a surplus supply of bread-stuffs sufficient to feed the whole population of Great Britain. I will here present a table showing the increased demand for our products since the modification of the British tariff. The following amounts were received in two or three days immediately preceding the 6th of May last at the ports of London and Liverpool from the United States:

24,000 bbls.	of flour,
3,000 bushels	of wheat,
3,939 bushels	of Indian corn,
1,135 sacks	of do do
2,717 bbls.	of do do
2,000 packages	of of beef,
594 do	of pork,
151 do	of bacon and hams,
4,360 do	of lard,
4 do	of tongues,
100 do	of bread,
101 do	of cloverseed,
1,079 do	of oilseed cake, an article used used in fattening swine,

10 hampers of potatoes, and numerous other articles not particularized.

As an article of food a very large quantity can be annually consumed by the laboring classes. Ireland alone would consume very large quantities of it, and her population is beginning to learn the difference in nutritive qualities between corn bread and the Irish potato. Here I will read a short extract from the speech of Sir Robert Peel, delivered in April last:

"I believe that a great revolution is taking place in Ireland by the introduction of meal made of Indian corn; and that there has been created a new taste for a better and more generous description of food. We find, from the example of workmen on railways, who are subsisting for the first time on an article of foreign produce, on which they had never before been accustomed to live, that they are able to work much longer, are much better than when they subsisted on that watery food, the potato. [Cheers.] Notwithstanding the

prejudices which have existed against this meal, but which are in the course of removal, there is an immense demand for the publication pointing out the way in which the meal can be cooked and dressed in the most approved manner in Ireland. Indian corn, however, is now admitted by a sort of sufferance, under an order of the treasury—what is wanted is the decision of Parliament. [Cheers.] It would, sir, give increased confidence to the importers, if the law were settled, and if those engaged in these speculations in the United States could have the guarantee of an act of Parliament, instead of an order of the treasury."

We are asked if Indian corn can be imported into Great Britain to the mutual benefit of both parties, why it has not been done heretofore? The reply is at hand. Corn-laws, and stringent commercial restrictions have fettered that branch of commerce. Again, it has not been heretofore favored by the ministry as it is now. He has read the debates in the British Parliament for the last twelve months to but little purpose, who does not clearly see a settled determination on the part of Sir Robert Peel, Lord John Russell, and others of the most distinguished men in Great Britain, to modify and liberalize their tariff policy, and to augment by all honorable means their commerce with this country. They, in this measure, are but following the dictates of a well-informed judgment as to their true interest. Permanent peace and unrestricted commerce between Great Britain and this country, the two greatest nations on the globe, would give a new spring to the prosperity of each, and would set an example to the rest of the world which would be in a great degree followed. The cause of humanity, of christianity, and the general prosperity of mankind would be essentially promoted by free commerce, and frequent intercourse between the nations of the globe, bringing together as brothers and friends those who are separated by seas and by continents. All human laws tending to limit and restrict this freedom, are but so many elogs and fetters on the happiness of man, and furnish additional proofs "that the world is governed too much."

